



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,509	09/23/2004	Fang-Chen Luo	12405-US-PA-0P	5508
31561	7590	03/31/2005	EXAMINER	
JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE 7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100 ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2 TAIPEI, 100 TAIWAN			BREWSTER, WILLIAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	
DATE MAILED: 03/31/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,509	Applicant(s) LUO ET AL.
	Examiner William M. Brewster	Art Unit 2823

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al., US Patent No. 6,737,305 B2.

Lee anticipates a manufacturing method of a thin film transistor (TFT), comprising:
col. 4, line 54 - col. 5, line 61, in fig. 4A, forming a gate 102 over a substrate 100;
in fig. 4B, forming an inter-gate dielectric layer 104 over the substrate covering the gate;
in fig. 4C, forming a channel layer 106 over a portion of the inter-gate dielectric layer at least over the gate, wherein the channel layer comprises a lightly doped amorphous silicon layer, col. 5, lines 4-18; and
in fig. 4E, forming source/drain regions 108 over the channel layer, wherein the source/drain regions are separated by a distance;
limitations from claim 2, the manufacturing method of claim 1, wherein the channel layer comprises an N-type lightly doped amorphous silicon layer, col. 5, lines 4-18;
limitations from claim 8, the manufacturing method of claim 1, wherein the step of forming the channel layer comprises:
in fig. 4C, forming a first lightly doped sub-amorphous silicon layer 106A over the portion of the inter-gate dielectric layer at a first deposition rate (LDR, low deposition rate); and forming a second lightly doped sub-amorphous silicon layer 106B over the first lightly doped sub-amorphous silicon layer at a second deposition rate, (HDR, high deposition rate), wherein the first deposition rate is lower than the second deposition rate, col. 5, lines 4-18;
limitations from claim 9, the manufacturing method of claim 1, further comprising a step of forming, in fig. 4E an ohmic contact layer (not shown, but described)

over the channel layer between the step of forming the channel layer and the step of forming the source/drain regions 108, col. 5, lines 25-32; limitations from claim 10, the manufacturing method of claim 1, further comprising a step of forming, in fig. 4F, a protection layer 110 over the substrate after the step of forming the source/drain regions covering the source/drain regions, the channel layer and the inter-gate dielectric layer, col. 5, lines 33-38. limitations from claims 6 and 7, the manufacturing method of claim 1; wherein the step of forming the channel layer comprises performing a chemical vapor deposition (CVD) process using a reaction gas mixture comprising a silane (SiH₄), hydrogen (H₂), col. 5, lines 55-61.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claims 1, 2, 8-10 above, and further in view of Yang et al., US Publication No. 2002/0102781 A1.

Lee does not specify using phosphine or boroethane, but Yang does. Yang teaches doping the amorphous silicon channel layer of the TFT with phosphine for an n-

type TFT or boroethane for a p-type TFT, p. 2, ¶ 25. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that combining Yang's process with Lee's invention would have been beneficial because the well-known industry dopants are readily available and cost effective.

Neither Lee nor Yang specify for claims 4 and 5, the concentration of the dopants, or claims 6 and 7, the ratio of the reactants. However, the practitioner may optimize these ranges:

"Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art . . . such ranges are termed 'critical ranges' and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality . . . More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation."

In re Aller 105 USPQ 233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmscher 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed dimensions of any unexpected results arising there from. Where patentability is aid to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another

variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William M. Brewster whose telephone number is 571-272-1854. The examiner can normally be reached on Full Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 571-272-1855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William M. Brewster
29 March 2005
WB